



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,883	09/26/2003	Michael R. Hill	AmSp:Slid1	9524

26790 7590 11/17/2004

LAW OFFICE OF KAREN DANA OSTER, LLC  
PMB 1020  
15450 SW BOONES FERRY ROAD #9  
LAKE OSWEGO, OR 97035

EXAMINER

SAKRAN, VICTOR N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3677

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/672,883

Applicant(s)

HILL, MICHAEL R.

Examiner

VICTOR N SAKRAN

Art Unit

3677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/26/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8 and 11-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Buren, Jr. U. S. Patent No. 2,823,434 in view of Ortega U. S. Patent No. 5,327,619.

Van Buren, Jr. discloses the general combination claimed of a sliding reusable connector for attaching an object to a base comprising a main body (14) having

Art Unit: 3677

first and second ends, a track member (24) formed at the first end of said main body, and a slide (16) having first and second ends including locking structure formed at one end of said slide and a locking means (slide stop) (22) formed at the second end of the main body; see Figures 1,3 6; column 1, lines 49-54; column 2, lines 7-11, 20-25, and claim 1, except that the reference to Van Buren, Jr. does not form the slide locking structure at the second end of its main body and does not provide an aperture-type secondary connection means in the body for securing its base to the object. Ortega teaches the use of a slide (30) having a locking structure (36,37) formed at one end thereof and a main body (10) having a locking portion (19,20) formed at its second end, so that the slider locking structure releasably engaging and disengaging with the locking portion in its main body; see Figures 3,4,6, and the abstract. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the location of the locking means in Van Buren, Jr. by merely forming its locking means at the second end of its main body including an aperture means to be formed in the base of its main body for securing the base to an object in the manner taught, disclosed and suggested by Ortega, especially, since such modification involves only routine skill in the art.

Furthermore, Applicant is reminded that in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teaching of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be

Art Unit: 3677

expected to draw therefrom; see *In re Preda*, 401 F2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342,344 (CCPA1968).

As to the particular length of the insertion opening in the main body as recited in claim 6, is considered to be no more than an obvious matter of design choice; especially, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, therefore, discovering the optimum or workable ranges is also involves only routine skill in the art. See *In Re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Moreover, the particular location and/or the arrangement selected of an elements is also considered to be no more than an obvious matter of design choice to one having ordinary skill within the art, especially, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention is involves only routine skill in the art. See *In Re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Claims 9 and 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the same references as applied to claim 1, above, and further in view of Darvie et al U. S. Patent No. 2,455,236 who teaches the use of a slide having grooves and ribs (18,18') in a sliding reusable connector and to further provide the slide in Van Buren, Jr. with at least one groove and at least one rib in the manner taught, disclosed and suggested by Darvie.et al it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3677


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant's attention is directed to the art cited herein, and of record, as showing structure related to Applicant's disclosed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VICTOR N SAKRAN whose telephone number is 703-308-2224. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. J. swann can be reached on 703-308-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 10, 2004

  
VICTOR N SAKRAN  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3677